

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,370	10/12/2000	Masashi Saito	07553.0010	4800
22852 7	590 09/09/2002			
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW			EXAMINER	
			KACKAR, RAM N	
			1763	7_
			DATE MAILED: 09/09/2002	T

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Application No. Applicant(s) 09/686,370 SAITO ET AL. Advisory Action **Art Unit Examiner** Ram N Kackar 1763 --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or I	b)]
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set if event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS 706.07(f).	ng date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 may been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amo 17 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply original by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the parned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under ally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed with 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dist</li> </ol>	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	•
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or s	search (see NOTE below);
<ul><li>(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</li></ul>	
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal issues for appeal; and/or	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding num	nber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been application in condition for allowance because: see attached.	en considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed S raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	OLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be enter explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	•
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)
0. Other:	GREGORY MILLS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Art Unit: 1763

Applicant's arguments and Examiners' response.

Applicant has raised new issue after amending claim 1 which would require further consideration and search. It is examiners belief that the said amendment does not bring novelty or non-obviousness over prior art.